IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER ELLIS)
Plaintiff,) Case No.:
V. Chicago Police Officers M. Wagner, Star No. 14637, J. Hunt, Star No. 11442, R. Youstra, Star No. 12912, E. Hernandez Star No. 3664, M. Bilina, Star No. 6269, S. Davis, Star No. 2939)) COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF) CIVIL RIGHTS))
Defendants.)) JURY DEMANDED)))))

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This action arises under the United States Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1871 (42 U.S.C. Section 1983). This court has jurisdiction under and by virtue of 28 U.S.C.
 Sections 1343 and 1331 and 1367.
- 2. Venue is founded in this judicial court upon 28 U.S.C. Section 1391 as the acts complained of arose in this district.

PARTIES

- 3. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff Christopher Ellis ("Ellis") was and is a citizen of the United States, and was within the jurisdiction of this court.
- 4. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer M. Wagner, Star No. 14637 ("Wagner") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under

color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department. This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.

- 5. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer J. Hunt, Star No. 11442 ("Hunt") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department. This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.
- 6. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer R. Youstra, Star No. 12912 ("Youstra") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department. This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.
- 7. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer E. Hernandez, Star No. 3664("Hernandez") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department. This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.
- 8. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer M. Bilina, Star No. 6269 ("Hill") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department.

 This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.
- 9. At all times herein mentioned, Defendant Chicago Police Officer S. Davis, Star No. 2939 ("Davis") was employed by the Chicago Police Department, and was acting under color of state law and as the employee, agent, or representative of the Chicago Police Department. This Defendant is being sued in their individual capacity.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. On or about November 10, 2014, Plaintiff was located on a public street in the City of Chicago.
- 11. At that place and date Defendants Wagner, Hunt, Youstra, Hernandez, Bilina, and/or Davis subjected Plaintiff to a custodial arrest.
 - 12. There was no probable cause for any Defendant to arrest Plaintiff.
- 13. During the course of Plaintiff's arrest one or more of the Defendants used force against Plaintiff including striking his person and using a taser device to administer at least one electrical shock to Plaintiff's person.
- 14. There was no legal cause for any Defendant to use any force against Plaintiff's person.
- 15. By reason of the above-described acts and omissions of Defendants, Plaintiff sustained injuries, including but not limited to, humiliation and indignities, and suffered great mental and emotional pain and suffering all to his damage in an amount to be ascertained.
- 16. The aforementioned acts of Defendants were willful, wanton, malicious, oppressive and done with reckless indifference to and/or callous disregard for Plaintiff's rights and justify the awarding of exemplary and punitive damages in an amount to be ascertained according to proof at the time of trial.
- 17. By reason of the above-described acts and omissions of Defendants, Plaintiff was required to retain an attorney to institute, prosecute and render legal assistance to him in the within action so that he might vindicate the loss and impairment of his rights. By reason thereof, Plaintiff requests payment by Defendants, and each of them, of a reasonable sum for attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1988, the Equal Access to Justice Act or any other provision set by law.

COUNT I Plaintiff against Defendants for EXCESSIVE FORCE

- 18. Plaintiff hereby incorporates and realleges paragraphs one (1) through seventeen (17) hereat as though fully set forth at this place.
- 19. By reason of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff was deprived of rights, privileges and immunities secured to him by the Fourth and/or Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States and laws enacted thereunder.
- 20. The arbitrary use of force by Defendants against Plaintiff's person was unreasonable in violation of Plaintiffs' Constitutional Rights and not authorized by law. These acts were in violation of Plaintiff's Fourth and/or Fourteenth Amendment rights. Therefore, Defendants, and each of them, in their individual capacity, are liable to Plaintiff pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

COUNT II Plaintiff against Defendants for UNREASONABLE SEIZURE

- 21. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate and reallege paragraphs one (1) through seventeen (17) hereat as though fully set forth at this place.
- 22. By reason of the conduct of Defendants, Plaintiff was deprived of rights, privileges and immunities secured to him by the Fourth and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and laws enacted thereunder.
- 23. Defendants violated the Plaintiff's Civil Rights in the following manner: 1) The arrest of Plaintiff was without any legal cause. The foregoing was unnecessary, unreasonable and excessive, and was therefore in violation of Plaintiff's rights. Therefore, the Defendants, and each of them, are liable to Plaintiff pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, by and through his attorneys, ED FOX & ASSOCIATES,

Ltd., requests judgment as follows against the Defendants, and each of them:

- 1. That the Defendants be required to pay Plaintiff's general damages, including emotional distress, in a sum to be ascertained;
- 2. That the Defendants be required to pay Plaintiff's special damages;
- 3. That the Defendants be required to pay Plaintiff's attorneys fees pursuant to Section 1988 of Title 42 of the United States Code, the Equal Access to Justice Act or any other applicable provision;
- 4. That the Defendants be required to pay punitive and exemplary damages in a sum to be ascertained;
- 5. That the Defendants be required to pay Plaintiff's costs of the suit herein incurred; and
- 6. That Plaintiff have such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

BY: <u>s/Garrett Browne</u>

ED FOX & ASSOCIATES, Ltd. Attorneys for Plaintiffs 300 West Adams Suite 330 Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 345-8877 gbrowne@efox-law.com

PLAINTIFF HEREBY REQUESTS A TRIAL BY JURY

BY: <u>s/Garrett Browne</u>

ED FOX & ASSOCIATES, Ltd. Attorneys for Plaintiffs 300 West Adams Suite 330 Chicago, Illinois 60606 (312) 345-8877 gbrowne@efox-law.com